



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/783,770	02/14/2001	Andrew G. Harvey	50325-0509 (3255)	2267

29989 7590 04/01/2004

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER, LLP
1600 WILLOW STREET
SAN JOSE, CA 95125

EXAMINER

ZHONG, CHAD

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2154

DATE MAILED: 04/01/2004

2

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/783,770

Applicant(s)

HARVEY ET AL.

Examiner

Chad Zhong

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 September 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on Fig. 1B is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-24 are presented for examination.

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

It is not clearly indicated where "206B" and "206C" exists on figure 1B (pg 6, line 22);

Appropriate correction is required.

Pg 1, line 14; pg 14, line 9, 222 should be changed to 210.

3. The use of the trademark TIB/Rendezvous software among others have been noted in this application (pg 1, line 16; pg 12, line 8). It should be capitalized wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, second paragraph

4. Claims 2-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

a. The claim language in the following claims is murky or not clearly understood:

i. As per claim 2-20, it is not clearly understood whether "a method" refers to "a method" in claim 1, line 1 (i.e. if they are the same, the word such as "said" or "the" must be used);

ii. As per claim 5, line 1-2, it is not clearly understood whether "a mapping" refers to "a mapping" in claim 1, line 4 (i.e. if they are the same, the word such as "said" or "the" must be used);

iii. As per claim 5, line 3, it is not clearly understood whether "a plurality of network devices" refers to "a plurality of network devices" in claim 1, line 4 (i.e. if they are the same, the word such as "said" or "the" must be used);

iv. As per claim 7, line 3, it is not clearly understood whether "an event" refers to "an event" in claim 1, line 9 (i.e. if they are the same, the word such as "said" or "the" must be used);

- v. As per claim 18, line 1, it is not clearly understood whether "a device" refers to "a device" in claim 1, line 8 (i.e. if they are the same, the word such as "said" or "the" must be used).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371 (c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

6. Claims 1-8, 15-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Amerden, US 2002/0103818.

7. As per claim 1, Amerden teaches a method of automatically subscribing a network device to a plurality of events applicable to a logical group of which the network device is a member, comprising the computer- implemented steps of:

creating and storing a mapping that associates a plurality of network devices with the logical group and that associates the logical group with one or more events that can pass over an event bus to which the network device is logically coupled (pg 1, [0012]; pg 5, [0066]);

receiving a device identifier of one of the network devices in the logical group (pg 7, [0148], [0149]);

receiving an event that is among the one or more events that are in the mapping (pg 9, [0189], [0190]; pg 11, [0213],[0214]);

based on the mapping, sending information to the network device that causes the network device to receive all events that are associated in the mapping with the logical group in which the network device participates (pg 9, [0189], [0190]; pg 11, [0213],[0214]);

8. As per claim 2, Amerden teaches a method as recited in Claim 1, wherein sending

information to the network device that causes the network device to receive all events comprises the steps of subscribing the network device to all the events that are in the mapping and associated with the network device at an event gateway that is coupled to the event bus (pg 12, [0027], [0029]).

9. As per claim 3, Amerden teaches a method as recited in Claim 1, further comprising the steps of receiving application specific mapping information from an application program and updating the mapping using the application specific mapping information (pg 12, [0227]; pg 13, table 1.1; pg 8, [0153], [0155]; pg 7, [0143], [0145]).

10. As per claim 4, Amerden teaches a method as recited in Claim 2, further comprising the steps of receiving application specific mapping information from an application program in XML format using a data access component that transforms the application specific mapping information from XML format into a canonical object model format (pg 9, [0185]-[0188]; pg 10, [0205]).

11. As per claim 5, Amerden teaches the method as recited in Claim 1, wherein the step of creating and storing a mapping comprises the steps of receiving information identifying a mapping in a data store that associates a plurality of network devices with the logical group and that associates the logical group with one or more events that can pass over an event bus to which the network device is logically coupled (pg 10, [0192]; pg 9, [0185]-[0188]; pg 8, [0153], [0155]).

12. As per claim 6, Amerden teaches a method as recited in Claim 1, wherein sending information to the network device that causes the network device to receive all events comprises the steps of generating, based on the mapping, a list of all the events that are in the mapping and associated with the network device, and sending the list to an event gateway that is coupled to the

event bus (pg 7, [0148]-[0151]; pg 12, [0229]).

13. As per claim 7, Amerden teaches a method as recited in Claim 1, wherein the mapping comprises an association of stored values that identify for each network device, an application, a group identifier, an event, a network device identifier, one or more published events, and one or more subscribed events (pg 7, [0148]-[0151]; pg 8, [0153], [0155]; pg 12, [0227]; pg 13, table 1.1).

14. As per claim 8, Amerden teaches a method as recited in Claim 1, wherein sending information to the network device that causes the network device to receive all events comprises the steps of:

receiving a call from a calling application program to a Resolve method, wherein the call includes one or more selection criteria selected from among device identifier, event subject, or action desired (pg 12, [0227]; pg 11, [0213]);

generating, based on the mapping, a list of all the events that are in the mapping and associated with the network device based on the selection criteria;

returning the list to the calling application program (pg 10, [0192]; pg 11, [0210], [0213]).

15. As per claim 15, Amerden teaches a method as recited in Claim 1, wherein receiving a device identifier comprises receiving a subscribe request that includes a router identifier for one of the network devices in the logical group and an event identifier (pg 8, [0153], [0155]).

16. As per claim 16, Amerden teaches a method as recited in claim 15, wherein sending information to the network device that causes the network device to receive all events that are associated in the mapping with the logical group in which the network device participates ordering comprises looking up the router identifier and the event identifier in the mapping and

receiving a subject list in response thereto (pg 10, [0206]; pg 11, [0213]).

17. As per claim 17, Amerden teaches a method as recited in Claim 15, wherein sending information to the network device that causes the network device to receive all events that are associated in the mapping with the logical group in which the network device participates ordering comprises looking up the router identifier and the event identifier in the mapping, receiving a subject list in response thereto, and applying the subject list to the network device at the event gateway (pg 10, [0206]; pg 11, [0213], [0214]; pg 12, [0229]).

18. As per claim 18, Amerden teaches a method as recited in Claim 1, wherein receiving a device identifier comprises receiving a publish request that includes a router identifier for one of the network devices in the logical group or a group identifier of the logical group, and an event identifier (pg 8, [0153], [0155]).

19. As per claim 19, Claim 19 is rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claim 16 above.

20. As per claim 20, Claim 20 is rejected for the same reason as rejection to claim 17 above.

21. As per claim 21, Amerden teaches a method of automatically subscribing a router in a network to a plurality of events applicable to a logical group of which the router is a member, comprising the computer-implemented steps of:

creating and storing a mapping that associates a plurality of routers with the logical group and that associates the logical group with one or more events that can pass over an event bus to which the router communicates (pg 5, [0066]);

receiving a subscribe request from the router that includes a router identifier that uniquely identifies the router and an event identifier (pg 7, [0143], [0148], [0149]; pg 8, [0153], [0155]);

looking up the router identifier and the event identifier in the mapping (pg 11, [0213]);

receiving a subject list in response thereto, wherein the subject list identifies all subjects to

which the router should subscribe (pg 11, [0213], [0214]);

sending information to the event bus that requests the event bus to subscribe the router to all events in the subject list (pg 11, [0213], [0214], [0227]).

22. As per claims 22-24, claims 22-24 are rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claim 21 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

23. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

24. Claims 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amberden, US 2002/0103818 in view of 'Official Notice'.

25. As per claim 9, Amberden teaches a method as recited in Claim 1, further comprising the steps of creating and storing the mapping using a plurality of programmatic objects that conform to an object model consisting of:

a group item class, a device class, an application class; and an event class (pg 7, [0142]; pg 9, [0185]-[0188]).

26. Amberden does not teach wherein objects based on the classes themselves can be instantiated from the classes. However, 'Official Notice' is taken by the Examiner that instantiation of objects from classes is notoriously well known. It would have been obvious to have used a instantiation step for the objects of their perspective classes for the current invention, because doing so would be less burdening for the individual units, through

instantiation, creation new classes which take up additional CPU time would be avoided.

Furthermore, Amberden teaches the idea of abstract data types, which would render the instantiation step possible for Amberden's system.

27. As per claim 10, Amberden teaches a method as recited in Claim 1, further comprising the steps of a subscribed mapping attribute value that specifies one or more subscribe events, and a publisher mapping attribute value that specifies one or more publish events (pg 9, [0186]-[0188]). The remaining section of claim 10 are rejected for the same reasons as claim 9 above.

28. As per claim 11, Claim 11 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 10 above.

29. Claim 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amberden, US 2002/0103818 in view of 'Official Notice', in further view of Hayes et al. (hereinafter Hayes), WO 95/14266.

29. As per claim 12, Amberden does not teach a method of claim 1, further comprising steps of a subscribed default flag value that indicates whether an external computation is carried out to determine the subscribe events.

30. Hayes teaches a method of claim 1, further comprising steps of a subscribed default flag value that indicates whether an external computation is carried out to determine the subscribe events (pg 4, lines 20-37).

31. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention was made to combine the teaching of Amberden and Hayes because they both dealing with updating and retrieval of centralized table in a remote location. Furthermore, the teaching of Hayes to allow a method of claim 1, further comprising steps of a subscribed default flag value that indicates whether an external computation is carried out to determine the subscribe events

would improve the security for Amberden's system by setting up access levels with the usage of the flags. The remaining sections of claim 12 are rejected for the same reasons as claim 10 above.

32. As per claim 13, Amberden does not teach a method as recited in Claim 12, further comprising the steps of determining whether the subscribed default flag value is clear, and if so, sending information to the network device that causes the network device to receive all events that are associated in the mapping with the logical group in which the network device participates.

33. Hayes teaches a method as recited in Claim 12, further comprising the steps of determining whether the subscribed default flag value is clear, and if so, sending information to the network device that causes the network device to receive all events that are associated in the mapping with the logical group in which the network device participates (pg 4, lines 20-37).

34. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention was made to combine the teaching of Amberden and Hayes because they both dealing with updating and retrieval of centralized table in a remote location. Furthermore, the teaching of Hayes to allow a method as recited in Claim 12, further comprising the steps of determining whether the subscribed default flag value is clear, and if so, sending information to the network device that causes the network device to receive all events that are associated in the mapping with the logical group in which the network device participates would improve the security for Amberden's system by setting up access levels with the usage of the flags.

35. As per claim 14, Amberden does not teach a method as recited in Claim 12, further comprising the steps of determining whether the subscribed default flag value is set, and if so, sending information to the network device that causes the network device to receive one or more

events based on computing a new list of events using an external algorithm.

36. Hayes teaches a method as recited in Claim 12, further comprising the steps of determining whether the subscribed default flag value is set, and if so, sending information to the network device that causes the network device to receive one or more events based on computing a new list of events using an external algorithm (pg 4, lines 20-37).

37. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention was made to combine the teaching of Amberden and Hayes because they both dealing with updating and retrieval of centralized table in a remote location. Furthermore, the teaching of Hayes to allow a method as recited in Claim 12, further comprising the steps of determining whether the subscribed default flag value is set, and if so, sending information to the network device that causes the network device to receive one or more events based on computing a new list of events using an external algorithm would improve the security for Amberden's system by setting up access levels with the usage of the flags.

Conclusion

38. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The following patents and publications are cited to further show the state of the art with respect to "Method And Apparatus For Mapping Network Events To Names Of Network Devices".

- | | | |
|------|----------------|-----------------|
| i. | JP 2000-003334 | Isomichi et al. |
| ii. | JP 2000-207362 | Fukumoto et al. |
| iii. | US 5950188 | Wildermuth. |
| iv. | EU 0375664 | Mann et al. |
| v. | US 6694450 | Kidder et al. |


vi. "Sun plans new offensive", InfoWorld, Framingham: May 17, 1999. Vol. 21, Iss. 20.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chad Zhong whose telephone number is (703) 305-0718. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A Follansbee can be reached on 703-305-8498. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

CZ
March 30, 2004.


ZARNI MAUNG
PRIMARY EXAMINER